

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,185	12/04/2001	Wojciech B. Kosmowski	1270.3	9131
7590 03/31/2004			EXAMINER HOWELL, DANIEL W	
Larry K. Roberts P.O. Box 8569				
Newport Beach, CA 92658-8569			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•	•		3722	10
		DATE MAIL ED: 03/31/200	1	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
•	10/005,185	KOSMOWSKI, WOJCIECH B.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
,	Daniel W. Howell	3722				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app						
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 De	ecember 2003.					
	action is non-final.					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>27-49</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>27-43 and 49</u> is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>44-48</u> is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the output of of the	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/005,185 Page 2

Art Unit: 3722

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- 2. Claims 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Piovano. Five spindles 43 are mounted on a crosspiece 11 (column 3, lines 5-7). Motor 54 rotates screw 52 in order to move the crosspiece and spindles laterally in the X direction. Worktable 8 is moved in the Y direction, and a motor moves spindles 43 vertically in a Z direction (column 3, lines 8-15). All of the XYZ drives are described as numerically controlled. All of the spindles are orthogonal to the worktable 8.
- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piovano. Lines 33-35 of column 4 of Piovano explicitly say that the crosspiece "may be fitted with a different number of machining heads." In view of this statement, it is considered to have been obvious to have provided only four machining heads, as it is clear that Piovano contemplated such an embodiment.
- 5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed.

.

Application/Control Number: 10/005,185

Art Unit: 3722

Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 6. Claims 27-36 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 5,920,973. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. Present claim 27 sets forth first and second sets of **ganged** spindles, while patented claim 1 does not explicitly use the word "ganged." Since the two spindle linear drive systems "commonly" drive the sets of spindles, the two sets of spindles may be considered to be "ganged" together, such that the present language of claim 27 is considered to be an obvious rewording of the structure of patented claim 1. It is noted that patented claims 2-20 are identical, respectively, to present claims 28-36.
- 7. Claims 37-40 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The spindle bearing of line 8 of claim 37 does not have antecedent basis. The first and second sets of spindles of claim 43 do not have antecedent basis.
- 8. Claims 37-40 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Application/Control Number: 10/005,185

Art Unit: 3722

9. Claims 44-48 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Page 4

- 10. It is noted that a preliminary amendment was mailed by Applicant just before the mailing of the first Office action. Since that first Office action did not treat the proper claims, this is a **non-final** second Office action.
- Any inquiry concerning the content of this communication from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Howell, whose telephone number is 703-308-1728. The examiner's office hours are typically about 10 am until 6:30 pm, Monday through Friday. The examiner's supervisor, Andrea Wellington, may be reached at 703-308-2159.

Any inquiries concerning other than the content of this and previous communications, such as missing references or filed papers not acknowledged, should be directed to the Customer Service Center for Tech Center 3700 at 703-306-5648.

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 3720 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office actions directly into the Group at FAX number 703-872-9306. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a USPTO deposit account. Please identify Examiner Daniel Howell of Art Unit 3722 at the top of your cover sheet.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

Daniel W. Howell Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3722